

10/644,206

PATENTAMENDMENT A (RESPONSE TO PAPER NO. 20050202  
(OFFICE ACTION DATED FEBRUARY 9, 2005))REMARKS

Claims 1-34 were pending in this case. In the amendment hereinabove, claims 1, 5-7, 18, 22-24 and 26-27 have been amended and claims 35-68 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-68 are now pending in this case. Based upon the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that, in conformance with the foregoing amendment, these claims are allowable.

A. §102 Rejection

Claims 1-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Chiu et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,369,678 ("*Chiu et al.*"). This rejection is respectfully traversed and it is submitted that these claims, in conformance with the foregoing amendment, recite subject matter which is not anticipated by and is patentable over *Chiu et al.*

Independent claims 1 and 18 have been amended hereinabove to more clearly distinguish the presently claimed invention from the disclosure of *Chiu et al.* (Dependent claims 5-7, 22-24 and 26-27 have also been amended for consistency.) More specifically, as is more expressly recited, in the presently claimed invention, "said second dose [of X-ray radiation] differs from said first dose in one or more of a plurality of X-ray radiation characteristics, and said first and second doses are at least partially non-contemporaneous" (emphasis added). In other words, not only do the first and second X-ray radiation doses differ in one or more of a plurality of X-ray radiation characteristics, but they are at least partially non-contemporaneous (e.g., sequential). As discussed in the present disclosure, e.g., at Figure 3 and paragraphs 00021-00022, this allows a region of interest to be identified and then viewed with an enhanced resolution.

In contrast to this, *Chiu et al.* expressly teaches exposure of a subject region with what amounts to a single X-ray radiation dose, i.e., one X-ray radiation

Atty. Docket No.: 03-015-US (10101.03.0150)- 22 -  
CHICAGO/#1305690.3

10/644,206

PATENTAMENDMENT A (RESPONSE TO PAPER NO. 20050202  
(OFFICE ACTION DATED FEBRUARY 9, 2005))

exposure which, although it transitions from a full dosage in the center to reduced dosages extending radially outward from the center, it nonetheless remains consistent in its radiation characteristics. As expressly taught in *Chiu et al.*, it is important—for the technique of *Chiu et al.*—that this single X-ray radiation exposure with consistent radiation characteristics be maintained so as to allow the user to “visualize the entire field of view for the purposes of orientation and placement, except that now the areas in the viewed image outside the point of interest are of lower quality.” Column 2, lines 59-62. Indeed, maintaining this image continuity, albeit with varying image quality, is so important in *Chiu et al.* that image correction is used to maintain a consistent overall gray level. Column 11, lines 48-60.

B. New Claims

Claims 35–68 have been added hereinabove. It is respectfully submitted that these claims add no new matter, are fully supported by the disclosure and are in condition for allowance.

Atty. Docket No.: 03-015-US (10101.03.0150)- 23 -  
CHICAGO/#1305690.3

10/644,206

PATENTAMENDMENT A (RESPONSE TO PAPER NO. 20050202  
(OFFICE ACTION DATED FEBRUARY 9, 2005))C. Conclusion

Claims 1-68 are now pending in this case. Based upon the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable, and reconsideration and early allowance of these claims are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

VEDDER, PRICE, KAUFMAN &amp; KAMMHOLZ, P.C.

Date: May 2, 2005 By: Mark A. Dalla Valle  
Reg. No. 34,147

Attorney for Assignee  
222 N. LaSalle St., 24th Floor  
Chicago, IL 60601  
312-609-7500  
Customer No.: 23,418

Atty. Docket No.: 03-015-US (10101.03.0150)- 24 -  
CHICAGO/#1305690.3